UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Prerequisites for Peace - - *Louis Wirth*

Belgium and the War - - *Devere Allen*

Our Machine Morality - *Richard D. Mosier*

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS

VOLUME CXXVI NUMBER 12

Chicago, February 17, 1941

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Declaration

In this time of growing tension of opinion and intolerance of spirit, it is appropriate that UNITY should reaffirm its position as a journal of liberal opinion.

UNITY is interested in no political party or platform, is bound to no school of philosophy or theology, is the organ of no sect or denomination, and is the voice of no organized movement. Rather is UNITY dedicated to certain underlying principles, namely, freedom, fellowship, and character in religion. It seeks the fulfilment of certain ideals, namely, representative democracy, peace, brotherhood, the commonwealth of man which is the kingdom of God on earth.

In dedication to its principles and in pursuit of its ideals, UNITY maintains the rule of liberty. Its editors, editorial contributors, and correspondents speak with unfettered freedom the convictions of their own minds within the general framework of a journal of liberal opinion. The writers of articles, reviews, and poems present their own ideas, which may, at times, be at variance with those of the editors. UNITY would repress no utterance and control no argument that is competent and honest, for it is skeptical of conformity and averse to authority, which always tend to hamper individual liberty. It is happy in those diversities of gifts and ideas which are the glory of the one spirit.

In this period of trial and crisis, UNITY would unite anew its editors and readers in the service of *Character* which is the substance of religion, *Freedom* which is its life, and *Fellowship* which is its goal. Thus would we vindicate our country, our civilization, our culture, religious and lay, in a period when all alike are threatened with extinction.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Salmon O. Levinson—CURTIS W. REESE 179
Notes 179
Jottings—J. H. H. 182
Aid to Great Britain—CURTIS W. REESE 188

ARTICLES—

Prerequisites for Peace—LOUIS WIRTH 182
Belgium and the War—DEVERE ALLEN 185
Our Machine Morality—RICHARD D. MOSIER 186
On the Pacifist Front—XXXI 189

TRUMPETS ON NEW HORIZONS—

Song for Dreamers—BLANCHE STEWART 190
Red Stain—LUCY REYNOLDS 190
Spears to Ploughshares—LUCIA TRENT 190
Reverberations—GRACE STILLMAN MINCK 190
Conscription—HELEN WADE SIEBENTHAL 190

THE STUDY TABLE—

The Gospel of a World Community—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES ... 191
Book Notes—CHARLES A. HAWLEY 191

THE FIELD—

Conditions in China—*The Christian News Letter, Oxford, England* 192

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Conditions in China

An account of conditions in China is given in the following letter from my friend Geoffrey Allen, who has just returned to this country. He was Fellow and Chaplain of Lincoln College, Oxford, and went out to China five years ago to teach in the Union Theological Seminary in Canton, which owing to war conditions has had to be transferred to the western province of Yunnan.

He writes: "Politically, there is still in China a very strong will to resist in the interior. Sometimes it takes forms which I wish were more likely to be fulfilled than they seem. When for instance, my Chinese friends say they will not yield even to the Japanese occupation of Manchuria, I think they are expecting something which on a realist view seems very far beyond their present strength. China is strong enough to hold out against Japan and harass Japan for a long time; it seems very doubtful if she is strong enough to take back the coast ports and the rivers against the strength of the Japanese fleet. It is likely to be a deadlock and a stalemate for many years, unless of course the war in the East lined up with the war in the West, and Japan had to face the American fleet on her lines of communication.

"The sufferings of the war are such as to make England seem luxurious. Where we were in Yunnan, the price of rice was twelve times its proper price. In the North war combines with flood; and people are said to be glad to eat chaff or the husks of peanuts. England has seen a little of evacuation problems. When Canton fell, the government said to a city of a million inhabitants, the city is going to be fired tomorrow morning; the city must be empty by dawn. Our own evacuation six months later meant a journey of four or five days by ship, three days by railway, two days by bus, and a further day by horse. It is good that people in England should know and face facts like these. In many parts of England there is as yet very little deliberate sacrificial suffering, apart from enforced sufferings through raids. It is well we should realize how much more we can suffer if we are called to, and still preserve intact everything in life which is of real and ultimate value.

"The problem of the occupied areas is still acute in China. It raises acute issues between political loyalties, and Christian universal loyalties to the destitute, regardless of political creed. It is difficult to get even some of the best of Chinese leaders to recognize a real responsibility for the mass of the destitute who are left in the occupied areas. They lack the centuries of Christian training on the rights of the individual. It is all too common to get a subconscious feeling that the coolie is not of real value to the life of the nation; and that therefore the sufferings or death of a few hundred thousand of the bottom class do not really matter or count. Yet the masses of the destitute are left in the occupied area. They need rice, and they need some kind of order and law. If these are not supplied in any other way, they

(*Continued on page* 192)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVI MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1941 No. 12

Salmon O. Levinson

UNITY records with profound sorrow the passing of Salmon O. Levinson, February 2, 1941. For many years Mr. Levinson was a member of the Board of Trustees of Abraham Lincoln Centre and a generous supporter of its activities, a faithful friend of UNITY and a frequent contributor to its columns. His passing is an incalculable loss and source of great sorrow to the many who knew him intimately and to the multitudes of the earth who knew of his labor in behalf of the juridical settlement of international disputes. In his life and work was the fruition of the best in democratic liberty,—a prophecy of world-wide good yet to be. He was broad in sympathy, wise in counsel, and devoted to human well-being. He was a statesman of humanity, as evidenced in his idea of the outlawry of war. Men of ages yet to come, in a world of liberty under law, will move to the rhythm of his thoughts and be guided by his will to peace and justice. An early edition of UNITY will be issued as a Salmon O. Levinson Memorial Number.

CURTIS W. REESE.

LINDBERGH IN WASHINGTON—AND HUTCHINS IN CHICAGO

When Lindbergh launched forth upon the wings of air that famous day when he crossed the Atlantic Ocean alone, he did no braver deed than when he sat before a hostile Congressional Committee and told his countrymen the truth about this war. What he said was like the flinging of a gauntlet in challenge to every great power of influence in this country. He disputed the President to his face; he defied the newspapers and other organs of public opinion; he ripped wide open the pro-British propaganda of the hour, and revealed to the light of day its essential character. As every most desperate endeavor has been made to hide and distort what Lindbergh said, and shamefully to defame the man himself, let us remind ourselves in this place of his actual testimony:

First, that this country stands in no danger of invasion.

Second, that Britain cannot win this war even with the help of the United States, unless there is a collapse inside Germany.

Third, that it is undesirable that either side in this war should win—that Wilson's "peace without victory" is as truly the beneficent outcome in this war as in the last war.

Fourth, that a negotiated peace is the only thing that can save our world from ruin.

This testimony is as true today as it will be proved to be true tomorrow. It is one of the few bits of sanity revealed in this country since the prevailing insanity began six months or so ago. And as though to sustain Lindbergh and to show that he was not quite alone in his calm, sure reasonableness, there spoke on the same day, in Chicago, the reassuring voice of President Robert M. Hutchins, of the University of Chicago. Denouncing what he flatly described as the war aims of President Roosevelt, Dr. Hutchins declared that America today is following the road to "suicide." And what a suicide!—the deliberate wrecking of the world's fairest prospect of democracy by our entrance into a European war which is in no way our concern, but which will destroy us as it is now destroying all the nations engaged in its futile and fatal hostilities! Troy would not listen to Cassandra—and went to her utter and complete ruin. But Cassandra was right—as our Cassandras are right today!

THE SWELLING CHORUS

But Colonel Lindbergh and President Hutchins are not the only distinguished and unimpeachable Americans who are testifying against present policies to take us into war. More recently there have come emphatic statements from General Hugh Johnson, of the U. S. Army, General Wood, a soldier and Chairman of Sears Roebuck & Company, Hanford MacNider, former head of the American Legion and former minister to Canada, William R. Castle, Under-Secretary of State under Herbert Hoover, Norman Thomas, leader of the Socialist Party, John R. Flynn, distinguished economist, and Philip LaFollette, former Governor of Wisconsin. This list of critics of the administration seems to us to be much more impressive than the list to date of administration supporters. What particularly strikes us, as we survey these names, is the fact that there is not a pacifist among them—not even Norman Thomas, whose attitude toward the present war is determined

by other issues. No pacifists—and not a few soldiers! All echo the convictions of General Hugh Johnson that the "lend-lease" bill is "just another big jump down the avalanche way," already so accelerated by President Roosevelt's radio speech and Congressional message; and all suggest the grim judgment of Dr. Hutchins, of Chicago, that the American people, if present tendencies continue, "are about to commit suicide." With these men the Editor of UNITY is in full accord. Ever since the change in the neutrality laws over a year ago, we have been in a state of alarm, believing that "the avalanche," as General Johnson calls it, had started, and that nothing but an unprecedented uprising of the American people could stop it. While the people are as emphatic as ever in their desire to stay out of war, the uprising has not come, very largely because—to quote General Johnson again—"it's just like a snowball rolling downhill." Progress towards war at any one moment has not seemed serious; but now the final crisis is upon us, and—to quote General Johnson again—"we'd better be careful." Careful, indeed—and determined! The fight over the "lend-lease" bill will in all probability decide for good and all the war-and-peace issue for this country. So we have no time to lose.

THE TRAGEDY OF GERMAN YOUTH

When we were in Germany in 1922, and again in later years, we were enormously impressed by the German Youth Movement. We remember a Sunday morning in Heidelberg when we were awakened in our inn by the shouting and singing, mostly the singing, of the boys and girls as in groups and companies they went striding through the streets on their way to a day in the fields and mountains about the ancient city. How picturesque they were in their hiking costumes, their packs and staves, and their contagious joy in the glad outdoors! Between 6 and 7 o'clock that morning there must have been a dozen parties marching by on that one street. Later on we went to the morning services in one of the Lutheran churches, and there in the meager congregation were a few scattered young people, clad for the day's outing, but waiting for their devotions before they started. Already the movement was largely non-religious—i. e., frankly pagan—though we did not see it, or at least feel it, at the time. Was this a preparation for Hitler? Of course what happened was that Hitler captured this movement complete, and there was scarcely a youth or maiden anywhere to protest, at least outside the Catholic churches. These German boys and girls were ready to be used—ripe for capture. Why did the Protestant churches, even the universities, to say nothing of the Republic, lose them utterly? What Hitler did to and with this younger generation is set forth in shocking detail in an article in the February *Survey Graphic,* entitled "German Youth Will Gladly Die," by Robert L. H. Hiller. The author, a young American resident in Germany, joined the "Young Nationalist Alliance" as early as 1927. The program of this organization was to "take boys out hiking, show them their native country, teach them clean living . . . no smoking and drinking." Hitler came along five years later—and swept everything into the Nazi flood. German youth were straightway taken in hand. Now look at them! They are hard, cruel, strong. "Might is right, weakness is sin . . . strength is the greatest virtue." Says this writer:

> The youth of Germany believe in hate, in brute force, in their own superiority. They will not surrender. They will destroy themselves like the knights of the crusades. The youth of Germany will die, will prefer to die, for Germany.

If youth can thus be trained to evil, why not also to good; if to die for the nation in war, why not for humanity in peace? What in this crisis are we proposing to do with our American youth? Educate them on the Hitler model, and send them likewise to die? What hope is there for our world along these lines? Instead of matching Hitler, why not Gandhi, whose Indian youth are the marvel of the age?

THE CASE OF CLARENCE HATHAWAY

Some weeks ago, Mr. Clarence Hathaway, for years the editor of the *Daily Worker,* was ousted from the Communist Party. Had he been living in the Russian paradise instead of bourgeois America, he would have been tried and executed, or spirited away to a concentration camp, or just disappeared altogether. It is difficult to carry out a first-class purge in this law-ridden country! Now comes Hathaway's confession of guilt, his approval of his own expulsion, and his blessing on the dear comrades who have turned their backs upon him. Exactly like the murdered Communists in Stalin's Russia, he revels in the masochism of self-abasement, and calls "holy, holy, holy" to the Party line. The mystery of what happened in Moscow, in those mysterious trials which condemned so many of the old Bolsheviks to disgrace or death, or both, is a good deal cleared up by this episode right here in New York. What's the matter with Hathaway, a native citizen, reared and educated in this country? Two things! A few years inside the Communist world has so warped and twisted his conscience that it no longer functions as a moral guide. Hathaway can apparently no longer discern truth from error, nor self-respect from shame. He crawls, and does not know he is crawling; he surrenders, and thinks he is conquering. But this is only a part of the story. Hathaway is more to be pitied than blamed. For the torture machine has undoubtedly been busy on him, and thus has beaten him down into abject subjection. Thus, the Party may "have" something on him, and is threatening to expose him to the authorities. Or it is hounding him from employment and social contacts, and is thrusting a like fate upon his friends and family. There are a hundred devices of social extermination, and the Com-

munists are adept in the ruthless application of them all to a writhing victim. Hathaway has sacrificed much to the Party—and now he is made to make the final sacrifice of honor. What a mess! What a hideous moral leprosy this Stalin Communism is! How comes it that a noble philosophy, as old as Plato, as pure as primitive Christianity, has thus been captured and degraded? It is like the spectacle of a lovely woman betrayed to a base and at last acquiescent prostitution. Some day the whole truth will out, and it will be seen to be one of the darkest tragedies of human history.

LIQUOR IS POISON

The Editor of UNITY believes, and has always believed, that liquor in any form is poison, and that in any truly educated and civilized society it would be banned as effectively as dope or poisoned food. Now come three scientists, members of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, to confirm our opinion. These scholars—Dr. Merrill Moore and Dr. Abraham Myerson, of Boston, and Dr. Leo Alexander, of Harvard University—unite in declaring that the Federal Food and Drug Administration should require all distillers to place on their bottles "a label warning that the liquid is a narcotic drug which is definitely harmful." Dr. Moore adds to this statement the opinion that "there is no reason why alcohol should not be labeled a poison in the same way that arsenic, carbolic acid and other poisons are labeled." Of course there *is* a reason —that labeling of this sort would interfere with profits and thus injure business, a thing much more important, as we discovered in the Prohibition experience, than the public welfare! Alcoholism, continued Dr. Moore, "is 1,000 times a greater problem than that of any other narcotic drug and the attack on it should begin with such simple approaches as 'Warning, Poison' labels on liquor bottles and perhaps on cocktail glasses." Meanwhile, following up comment in UNITY's last issue on this point, it is interesting to note that, according to latest official reports, bootlegging is flourishing mightily. Thus in the New York area alone it is estimated that state and federal governments lost more than $5,000,000 in 1940 through bootlegging. In this one area, federal agents in the twelve-month period uncovered 455 illegal stills and arrested 1592 persons. "Of course," runs the report, "hundreds [of stills] *have not yet been found.*" The booze business, in other words, is still running full blast outside the law. And this, we were told, was an evil peculiar to Prohibition, and with the repeal of Prohibition would disappear! We said "nonsense" then—and now our judgment is confirmed. Americans fooled themselves in those hysterical days, just as they are fooling themselves in these hysterical days about the war. Nothing that is being said and believed is true, for the simple reason that now as then, on the war issue as on the liquor issue, men are throwing reason overboard and are succumbing to pure emotion. Experience as old as man tells the whole story about war, just as the same experience tells us the whole story about alcohol. But in the one case as in the other we learn nothing, and so repeat the same old mistakes and suffer the same old ills.

THE ISSUE OF WAR OR PEACE

The *Christian Century* has published an absorbing series of articles on the question, "If America Enters the War, What Will *I* Do?" Five pacifists are writing on one side of the question, and five anti-pacifists on the other. The answers given are direct and forthright; the disputants are not avoiding or evading the issue. The result is that the issue between pacifism and anti-pacifism in the current situation is becoming clear. It is none other than the question as to whether the present war is like the last war, or is something quite different. It is just here, at this point of controversy, that the controversialists meet in head-on collision. The anti-pacifists argue consistently that this war between the British Empire and the German Reich is a unique struggle, at least in this our time. It is barbarism come to life again, to front civilization and all our culture with the menace of destruction. The pacifists, on the other hand, contend as consistently that this war is what Mr. Churchill has definitely said it is —"only a continuation of the last." This last war, as a matter of fact, never stopped, but went right on through the so-called post-war period into this present resumption of active hostilities. Even if there is doubt upon this point there remains the fact that war is *war* —it is ever the same evil to be ever the same condemned! In this sharp clash of opinion, there stands one fact upon which both sides seem tacitly or openly agreed; this is the fact that the last war was a wicked affair, which deserved no support on either side, and which America should not have entered. Which is a very great gain in itself for the pacifists, for we can remember easily the time, back in 1917-19, when anti-pacifists and people generally were arguing about the last war exactly as anti-pacifists are now arguing about this war! It was something "different," a war of civilization against barbarism, a fight to make the world safe for democracy. Now we know, and the anti-pacifists concede, that this last war was not "different" at all, but just the same old horror of *war*. Which gives us sound reason for believing that in due course we shall know, and anti-pacifists will again concede, that *this* war also was not "different," but again the same old horror. As a matter of fact wars are never "different," except as we deliberately or ignorantly idealize them to suit our purposes. They are what they are—"the consensus of all crimes." Hence may the pacifist be content. The future will bring him the justification the present denies.

Jottings

It was Oscar Wilde who said, in one of his most brilliant moments, that life imitates art. A perfect illustration of the truth of this dictum is now being furnished by Mr. Willkie, the living dramatization of the old story of the hen which hatched a duck's egg. Look at the dismay of the Republican Party as its late presidential candidate goes swimming in Mr. Roosevelt's pond!

The New York *Herald-Tribune* publishes this dispatch from Tokio:

> The Diet yesterday surrendered its right to examine and question publicly policies and actions of the Cabinet. . . . The decision of the Diet to dismiss itself is unprecedented. It may be compared to the adjournment of the Reichstag following the rise of the Nazi party in Germany.

Or—to the "lend-lease" bill!

The Christian News Letter, published in Oxford, England, reports that "the authorities are very keen on our scheme [of organizing the crowds in the bomb-shelters for entertainment and instruction] as there is real danger of the downfall of general civilization under such ghastly conditions."

Quite so! They had better be "keen." For that's what war is—"the downfall of general civilization."

Gen. Hugh Johnson, writing in his widely-printed newspaper column, says of the "lend-lease" bill now before Congress:

> People who have the nerve to number "1776" a new bill practically authorizing our naval and military reunion with the British Empire can't be expected to know nor care that they propose to cancel out the Declaration of Independence, repudiate the American Revolution, dilute our strength with the world's weakness, finance a new world war even to the bankruptcy of the United States and pave the way for Bolshevist revolution and the triumphs of Communism—everywhere in the world.

Yes, General, that number, "H.B. 1776," tells it all. An accident as strange as that is worth pondering.

The New York *Herald-Tribune* "Books" reports a subscriber who "wishes to spend the winter months in preparation for post-war travel in England, and asks for a list of books for planning tours."

We nominate this subscriber as a candidate for the 1941 Nobel Prize for Optimism.

By the same token as the above, we nominate President Roosevelt for a first prize for understatement, when he declared on his recent birthday:

> "These are not completely happy days for any of us in the world."

J. H. H.

Prerequisites for Peace

LOUIS WIRTH

Much of the discussion now current concerning the war aims of the various countries is sheer demagoguery. The countries that still survive the Nazi aggression have only one primary and immediate aim: to avert their destruction or conquest by the Nazis. That is their war aim insofar as an honest answer could be got out of Britain, Greece, and China. It would be foolish to ask the Nazis what their war aims are. Insofar as they have already stated them before the war started, they can be summed up in one phrase: The aim is to conquer as much of the world as could be conquered. Since the war started, and since the opinions of neutrals, such as the United States, must be taken into account, these aims have been disguised in various pious phrases, such as to destroy pluto-democracy, to free the submerged peoples now held in chains in the British empire, to give Germany *Lebensraum,* or even to establish a true democracy such as is alleged to exist in Germany itself. These phrases of Mr. Goebbels are not to be taken seriously. The countries now under the Nazi heel could testify, if testimony were needed, as to what the true aims of the Nazis are.

The real issue is not the war aims of the contending powers but their peace aims. What kind of a world can we expect if the totalitarian nations come out victorious, and how does this world differ in prospect if Great Britain wins? We already have fairly accurate blueprints from the Nazi leaders of the kind of a world they would build. Whether we can trust their statements or not is another matter. But even the most optimistic and benevolent interpretation of their utterances leads to the prospect of a world dominated by a superior race in which the alleged new order will consist in the subservience of all the conquered peoples to the superior conquerors. We have only meager expressions from the leaders of Britain as to the kind of world they would create. Presumably at worst it would be a world in which Germany would be held in more or less permanent subjection and the rest of the world rebuilt in the image of the British empire. This is none too glowing a prospect in the eyes of those who are asked to contribute to the holy cause. But even at worst it is a brighter prospect than is offered by a victory of the Nazis. We have been hearing, however, not only from Mr. Churchill and the conservatives, who still at least nominally dominate Britain, but also from British labor. These utterances at least hold out a slender hope that some of the unfulfilled promises of democracy may be given a chance. While personally I have no appetite to fight for the restoration of Poland, Czechoslovakia, or even the Scandinavian countries and the low countries that have been conquered, and while I certainly have no appetite to make sacrifices for the preservation of the British empire as it now stands, if

we are to have a choice between only two evils, namely, either a Nazi victory and a Nazi-dominated world on the one hand and the world that would come out of the Tory mentality of Mr. Churchill, there is no doubt in my mind as to which I would prefer. It is obviously the latter. But we may have other choices.

All of this adds up to one decisive conjecture: that if the Nazis win, the condition of the world upon their victory will more nearly resemble the jungle than civilized life. Our dreams of what will happen when tomorrow comes will be idle if that tomorrow brings a victory of the totalitarian powers over the last remaining more or less democratic peoples. To talk about a just peace that is to end this war and about an era of secure peaceful and productive life in a free world that is to follow will be idle if the peace is to be dictated by the Nazis. Nor will there be even the slenderest prospect for us as a people to preserve, much less to enhance, the values of life that we cherish, if the Nazi victory comes before we have time to gird our loins against the totalitarian onslaught, which in case Britain falls we must virtually face alone. Even if we should have a brief respite to marshal our resources in the fight for our existence, our social, economic, and political system would be so severely strained that it would scarcely resemble the society we have known. The defense against the foe that has all the rest of the world's resources at his command and will shut us out from world trade and will force us to transform our nation into an armed camp will leave us little chance to maintain either our liberties or our economy intact. We will not only not be able to hold on to our gains, but we will also find closed the road to our striving for the fuller realization of the kind of order that we envisage as approximating a good society.

It is only therefore on the assumption that the totalitarian powers will be defeated that there is any sense in speculating about a better world. While this struggle goes on it is worth while to take time out to think through the issues that are involved in the struggle between democracy and totalitarianism, so that we will gain strength in our efforts by the knowledge of why the Nazis must be defeated if the kind of world in which we can live as free men is to endure. Indeed, it is only if we know precisely what it is that we are fighting against and what it is that we are fighting for that we can entertain any hope of final victory at all. Ambiguity about principles, lack of clarity about our goals, and uncertainty on the ways of achieving them will make us prey to the siren voices of appeasement, compromise, and defeatism. If we fall victim to our own uncertainty and lack of conviction, we will have lost the battle before we have ever entered it.

It is not enough to say, as we said in 1917, that we are fighting to make the world safe for democracy, or even to add that this is positively the last and final effort that we will make to do so. Nor is it enough to say that we are fighting to defeat the forces of totalitarianism, as we were then fighting to beat the Kaiser. No phony phrases will do. There is already too much cynicism in the world and too much skepticism and disillusionment to allow even the most sanguine propagandist to hope that he will get away with it this time among a people that is still free to listen to the radio and to read the newspapers and to talk back and not merely to murmur, as we hope it will be possible to do for some time to come.

One of the first premises of a victory and of a decent peace after it, is a clear recognition on our part that neither we, nor the British, nor the Greeks, nor any of the other peoples that we may enlist on our side have as yet realized the democratic ideal, that in fact we, and much more so they, are far from it. We are as yet democracies only in our aspirations or in contrast to the totalitarian regimes arrayed against us. Bountiful as the blessings of our form of government and of our social and economic life truly are when compared with those of the peoples under the heel of the totalitarian tyranny, unless we are firmly resolved that we are merely on the way to a fuller realization of freedom, self-development, and order, many of us will lose heart in the face of the sacrifices that will assuredly be asked of us.

We must be clear as to what values inherent in our way of life, both realized and as yet unrealized, we are fighting for, that are threatened by the forces of darkness; and we cannot leave to the indefinite future the decision as to the ways and means for achieving the substance of our hopes. There must be ample guaranties to those who do the sacrificing, which probably will mean all of us, that the objectives we seek to achieve will not be surrendered in the course of the war and that we will not be sold down the river when peace comes to be made. But if it is true—and there seems to be no doubt about it—that if we allow the totalitarian powers to win we will not even have a chance to plan for the better order that is to come, then obviously our firm resolve must be to insure the defeat of the powers whose victory would not only blast our existence but our hopes.

Perhaps it is idle to speculate as to what difference it would have made in the world if President Wilson's fourteen points, which inspired the hopes of mankind as the first World War came to an end, had been realized. Given genuine content, the noble phrases which he uttered, if translated into acts of statesmanship, would probably have avoided the second World War. Whatever historians may agree to have been the causes for the failure of Wilson's formula for world reconstruction, one factor undoubtedly was its desertion by the American people themselves. It would be a mistake to underestimate the great accomplishments in world reconstruction attributable to the sentiments and the actions which Wilson's fourteen points generated, especially when we hear from so many sources denunciations of the Wilsonian idealism and the motives that prompted it as sentimentality, utopian impracticality, and capitalistic hypocrisy. That so pathetically little of the promise of the fourteen points was translated into actuality was probably due as much to our nation's turning its back on Wilson's peace aims as to their scuttling by the statesmen of Versailles.

Noble as these aims may have been in the period of the first World War, any peace plan which is likely to end the second World War, in case of a democratic victory, will probably have to go much beyond the horizon of what was envisaged as desirable and as possible in 1918. We can now look back upon all of the shortcomings of the peace and the plan for a new world order of a generation ago. The world has moved much since then. Latent forces have been awakened which were still slumbering then. Appetites and aspirations have been generated which must be reckoned with, and at the same time possibilities have come into view which were only faintly glimmering hopes when the first World War ended.

To many, the League of Nations may seem to have failed because it tried to go too far; to us in 1940 it is quite clear that it failed because it did not go far enough. In 1918 we were still concerned about carving new sovereign states out of the map of the world, and especially out of the tattered map of Europe. To us of today it appears as if the day of sovereign states is over. The mentality of the first World War dared hardly even dream of anything beyond a gradual and slight reduction in armaments, whereas we must face the probability that the retention of any potentially offensive armaments in the hands of any nation undermines the prospect of peace. Only the most utopian of dreamers of a generation ago would have conceived of extending international law and order to the point where it seriously affected the sovereign right of each nation to regulate its internal affairs as it pleased. We realize today that unless each nation is effectively restrained from adopting certain inhuman and immoral internal policies, there is little hope of building up an orderly and civilized world community.

We can get a glimpse of some of the minimum essentials of a framework for world reconstruction appropriate to our time in a passage in President Roosevelt's message to the 77th Congress on the state of the Union, in which he said:

> In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.
>
> The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world.
>
> The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world.
>
> The third is freedom from want—which, translated into world terms, means economic understanding which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world.
>
> The fourth is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world.
>
> That is no vision of a distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation. That kind of world is the very antithesis of the so-called new order of tyranny which the dictators seek to create with the crash of a bomb.

It remains to implement these four salient premises for an orderly and civilized world through appropriate measures which cannot help but profoundly affect the traditional conception of sovereignty the world over. It is also apparent that these presuppositions of a new world order imply the emergence of a form of world government going far beyond the tenuous structure represented by the League of Nations.

We cannot afford to take the condescending view that the sovereign power of every other nation must be clipped except our own, nor can we hope to get the other nations of the world to submit to some sort of an effective international government if we insist on claiming exemption from such regulations.

The United States emerged out of the first World War as the greatest single power on earth, and there is every prospect that if the totalitarian powers are defeated in the present war, we will emerge out of it with our position as the world's greatest power insured and enhanced. This imposes upon us an unprecedented responsibility not to police the world by ourselves, for we could not do this alone if we tried, but rather to see to it that the world community which modern technology, economy, and communication have made into a fact also acquires the institutional, and particularly the legal, structure which can hold this community together in peace and in order.

What we have known as sovereign nations in the past may have to be transformed into cultural provinces in the future. The line of demarcation between affairs domestic and foreign will become considerably blurred, and men the world over will be each other's keepers to an extent hitherto undreamt of. In short, what is required is that the world which has been created and shrunk by modern technology, by propaganda, and by the bonds of interdependence and mutual vulnerability that have been molded by the free flow of goods, of men, and of ideas will have to take on the institutional and legal cast of a cosmos.

If we are serious about our desire to build a world in which men can be reasonably free, reasonably secure, and reasonably happy, we must be prepared to make of democracy an article for export. This does not mean that we must impose democracy upon others by the sword. It does mean that we, together with all other peoples, must be prepared to renounce our vested rights to dominate and to exploit others. It means the disappearance of such special privileges as tariffs and trade barriers, the disappearance of colonies and the prerogatives of rulership over others. It means giving all peoples an untrammeled right to choose their intellectual and cultural pursuits within the framework of a single world political, legal, and economic order.

This may mean too that when the armistice comes we will not be able suddenly to disband our armed forces and to relapse into an isolationist slumber. We will have to bear our share of the responsibility that will be thrown into the laps of the more or less free nations of the earth to see that the peace is kept, to steer the world through the transition stage to the emerging new order. It will mean, too, a new domestic order for us, as it will mean a new international order. For only insofar as no nation will be able to maintain racial, caste, and class barriers within, will it be inclined to keep the peace without.

It is to be anticipated that the translation of this vision into concrete reality, into constitutions, laws, forms of administration, and police power will encounter many serious obstacles from all sides. But it would be the crassest form of self-deception to assume that anything less than the realization of an economic and political world organization will in the long run save us from anarchy and the sporadic recurrence of ever more destructive wars. Unless our vision reaches farther than our grasp, the peace that will follow this war will be a brief and perilous truce during which we too will lose not only the substance but even the memory of democracy.

It would be fatal to think of the aims of the warring powers on the side of democracy as adequate if they were confined merely, as some spokesmen of the old order seem to put it, to the reëstablishment of the national independence of Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Baltic and the Scandinavian states, and the low countries. It would be equally fatal to think of the peace as an object worthy of achievement if it merely destroyed the military prowess of the totalitarian states or, even worse, if it sought to dismember these states themselves. The plain fact is that the day of colonies, empires, balances of power, and similar contrivances is over. The economic life of peoples can no longer be separated from their political life; their technology can

no longer be kept out of joint with their social institutions and their legal and moral order.

We may get less than we hope for when the armistice comes, but to ask less than what sound judgment tells us is necessary to prevent a recurrence of the past would be sheer folly. What is most to be remembered through the months that lie ahead is that a world order cannot be improvised and that principles cannot be compromised. This requires of us as a nation not only that we keep the flickering flame of a good society burning in our own country but that we refrain from attempting to sell something to others which we have not been able to sell to ourselves. If we are serious in believing that a democratic order is worth fighting for, we must be willing to translate the word "democracy" into deeds at home. These deeds must be able to speak for themselves to other peoples and will so speak as soon as the millions now silenced and deafened by the terror of dictatorship are again free to listen and to speak for themselves.

Belgium and the War

DEVERE ALLEN

As papers go, the New York *Times* is one of the best. That fact is generally admitted, and the writer often adds his voice to the chorus of praise. But the *Times,* too, as numerous critics have shown in the past with abundant documentation, occasionally goes off on tangents which affect its objectivity. That it will even resort to suppression of correspondence to support an editorial policy is indicated by my own inability to get into the correspondence columns of the *Times* much information of a new and reliable character gleaned at first hand from a knowledge of Belgium based on superior opportunities to learn the truth.

No one needs to be reminded of the way in which King Leopold was presented, after his surrender of the Belgian army, as a deliberate traitor, pro-Nazi, coward, and even plotter against his people. That myth has now been pretty well exploded. *Life* and other periodicals have come out with the truth—half a year after I tried vainly to submit new and unpublished documents which were turned down by certain intellectual weeklies, the New York *Herald Tribune,* and the New York *Times.* Can anyone deny that from the viewpoint of journalism the last order of the day issued to his troops by Leopold on May 25th and stating that whatever happened he would share the fate of his men (explaining his refusal to flee and giving the background for several obscure issues around which fiery controversy was raging) was news? Yet I could get no large paper to print the text when I sent it to them last July. Almost five months later it was finally printed in *Life.* There was no reason except for prejudice and deliberate distortion why it could not have become generally known to the American public early last summer.

Now, however, another myth exists which the prejudiced press will not allow me to explode. Another journalistic discovery has been placed in its lap, but it is not interested. A matter of serious moment for historians, for commentators on passing events, for those who want to understand truthful backgrounds of European politics, cannot be illuminated because the New York *Times* will not print the truth about it in its correspondence columns. No excuse can be made that the presentation was too lengthy, too unreasonable, or insufficiently documented. There is only one excuse: the *Times* has people on its staff, or has a policy they must adhere to, unwilling to have its editorial opinions controverted by actual evidence.

There are many, many issues on which the present writer's word is inferior in value to the word of numerous others. That ought not to be the case regarding Belgian affairs. I was familiar with the country when I went there in July, 1939. During the months that followed, right up to the invasion (and from detailed reports thereafter) I had exceptional privileges. My acquaintance ranged from court circles to radical trade unions, from peace groups to army officers. Repeatedly I drove through every part of the countryside. In addition to my own inquiries, I had the aid of two other staff writers. Every door was opened to me, and I had the friendship of highly placed officials. My objectivity was sufficiently trusted so that I was asked to make a tour of the front and the cantonments in March, weeks after the area had been closed to foreign and even Belgian journalists. I have stated flatly, and can prove, that the conventional American version of Belgian neutrality is false. That falsehood has been fostered by ignorance and by systematic cultivation.

If Americans can be convinced that Belgium is responsible for the whole Allied collapse in France, as certain ill-informed writers have openly contended, relief efforts will be curtailed and the entire issue of feeding the neutral victims of Hitler will be complicated by bitterness and vindictive spite, and not settled on other considerations. For sake of the future, what might be deemed a technical political-military question takes on wide humanitarian significance. On December 5 the *Times* said editorially, "The original documents published today by the Belgian-American Educational Foundation should finally acquit King Leopold of any suspicion of dishonor in the surrender of his army last May." The *Times* then goes on to concede the truth of a situation which it refused to correct, even in its correspondence columns, less than two months after the event—at a time when popular interest was at its peak. But the *Times* still must grind the old axe, even if the dents in its blade are serious. It says: "The friends of Belgium are not on solid ground when they now argue that the Belgian neutrality policy, the King's policy, was neither pro-Ally nor pro-German, but 'pro-Belgian.' It was in reality a gift to Hitler."

The *Times,* clearly, must have an alibi for the Allied failure. The *Times,* clearly, has a right to cling to this piece of popular hokum and hug it fearfully to its editorial bosom. But has a paper like the *Times* a right to suppress relevant evidence that contradicts its illusions? If the *Times* will not print such evidence, others will have to, and adequate space to bring forth the facts is a necessity. Readers can judge for themselves whether it is trivial or genuinely important; whether it carries internal conviction of truth or appears unfounded; whether or not the *Times* wants the whole

truth to reach its readers. The facts are given in the following suppressed letter:

Wilton, Connecticut.
December 10, 1940.

To the Editor of the New York *Times:*

Although you have grudgingly admitted in your editorial columns that King Leopold has been unjustly accused of "treason" for his surrender of the Belgian army in Flanders, you still cling to the common belief that the plans of the German high command would have been foiled if Belgium had permitted an advance occupation of her soil by French and British troops. For that supposition, however, there is little more actual evidence than the more personal one regarding Leopold. Indeed, there is reason to believe in its falsity.

As editor of a news service with headquarters in Brussels from July, 1939, up to the invasion, and with previous familiarity with the country, I had access to much information that has not generally been available here. There are certain things which need to be said. I do not put them forward to argue them, but in order to contribute materials for a balanced eventual judgment.

1. Neutrality was not a device of the King, his Foreign Minister, M. Spaak, or any political group, in the sense that they put something across that was not wholeheartedly desired by the people. Organized efforts to change that policy, sometimes encouraged from outside, made no headway with public opinion. Leading officials of the Walloon and Flemish trade unions, totalling over 600,000 active members, assured me last February when I specifically interviewed them on the point, that their respective sections of the labor movement were 95 and 98 per cent behind the neutrality program. It was apparent that they spoke correctly. Most outspoken always, in criticism of the Nazis, were the organs and members of the Belgian Workers' Party (Socialist). Yet when several distinguished and revered leaders undertook to reverse the party's endorsement of neutrality at the annual convention in late December, 1939, they found themselves up against such a stone wall that they gave up the attempt without introducing the resolution they had prepared for debate.

2. There was slight popular confidence in the ability of the British or the French to give combined aid, in the event of an invasion, that would be dependably effective. In many circles, there was doubt even that an Allied occupation, by arrangement, would prevent a successful Nazi attack, and universal feeling that it would be thus precipitated. All winter the Belgian papers carried photographs of British vehicles, purporting to be parts of an armored division, drawn up on the frontier and ready for dispatch into the country on an instant's notice. These were all of a piece with certain handouts made available to the press by a British agent with a French name which quite honestly belonged to him. But numerous highly placed Belgians knew what I found to be true upon investigation in France, and what was proved true by events: that the equipment of the armored division was still back in England, while the men trained to use it had been sent to France.

Justifiable nervousness was also felt about French intentions. Poland was well remembered; later, so was Norway. But long before spring had arrived the Havas Agency, officially controlled, sent to French dailies, widely circulated in Belgium, reports to the effect that the French army command might not, after all, try to hold the Germans on the Albert Canal or the Meuse when the enemies came to a showdown, but instead might stand on the protected forests near the northern end of the "big" Maginot Line and the floodable area north and east of Dunkerque. I know positively that some Belgian army officers were perturbed by these reports; and that many civilians were rendered uneasy and more recalcitrant to French requests.

3. The plan of invasion was modeled on the earlier von Schlieffen plan, it is true; but it was notably modified by a German strategist whose name seems unknown to Americans: Wilhelm Groener. Hitler has honored Groener in a quiet, inconspicuous way, but not with public fanfares because this author of two influential books, *Der Feldherr Wieder Willen* and *Das Testament des Grafen Schlieffens,* had the "misfortune" to be the son of a private soldier. I learned some time ago that Groener drafted a plan which anticipated an advance occupation of Belgium by the Allies, and which satisfied the German command that from it they had nothing to fear. The plan had as its essentials the very pincers movement that was utilized last May and June, with possibly heavier pressure and a more rapid attack on the Allied left flank in order to hem in a larger number of defending forces. I was told flatly on the 25th of last February, by a Belgian army officer who appeared to have some knowledge of the plan, that an advance occupation would by no means make the difference that many Allied critics thought. This officer was a notorious anti-pacifist; and he was not one of the occasional stuffed shirts whose ideas of military prowess came from a professional pride.

Simple justice will compel historians and other students of international affairs to give to these facts whatever weight they deserve in the total picture. For obvious reasons I have not used names but if need be will give them, with supporting evidence, to the editor of the *Times.*

These are considerations I have not seen presented. Added to them was the common view that, while bravery could be counted on among the Belgians as always in the past, the scars of the old war had never healed, and that it was asking too much of one nation to make it the leading battlefield a second time within a quarter century, especially when it had a population of only eight millions and when, if it could not depend at all on Nazi pledges, it could not place complete assurance in Allied ability to carry out pledges.

Our Machine Morality

RICHARD D. MOSIER

In the midst of the confusing welter of noise and machines, we are beginning to realize that our morality is arbitrarily imposed upon us by our machine civilization. Machines mean progress, coöperation, a morality patterned after turning wheels and smoking furnaces. The extraordinary feature of this morality is that it is not stable. Change, it seems, is the one certain thing in this modern world. And changes in our moral structure seem threatening. It is alarming to realize that the morality imposed upon us by our machines is a morality that is always changing. Old moralities are cracking under the ceaseless hammering of progress, and we flounder for new rules of conduct, new philosophies, and new ideals. We are laboring under the changing, evolving morality of our machines. Can we accept a machine morality?

William James used to say that the human race has never accepted responsibility for introducing morality into the world. He might have added that the human race has never accepted the morality that it did introduce. In a changing, evolving world, that is impossible. To cling stoically to iron-clad fiats of conduct in an age of noise and machines is a veritable impossibility. The ceaseless pattern of change imposes its will upon us, and we flounder for new rules of conduct with each generation. But there was an age, perhaps, when tethering oneself to the inviolable code of the group had survival value.

Primitive groups developed ways of doing things which were the necessary concomitants to group survival. The group had a way of life, and it had to be passed on to the new generation. Boys and girls had to be initiated into the sacred rites of the group religion. The wrath of angry gods had to be appeased. Methods

of hunting and fishing had to be passed on to the nude children that flooded the tribal community. In order to protect their heritage, the group indoctrinated its young tyros into the group way of life. These folkways, these ways of doing things, enabled the primitive group to cope with the brutal irrationality of its environment.

The environment of the primitive man was his enemy as well as his friend. It provided him with food and water and shelter and a few tools, it is true; but it also brought a thousand dangers that lurked in forest and field waiting to devour or mutilate him. The lightning struck with vehement wrath at his home and family. Members of other primitive groups were ready to pounce upon him as soon as he entered their hunting-ground. Starvation, death, and disease awaited the primitive man around every corner. He attributed the antagonism of his environment to angry gods, whom he sought to propitiate through various rites and sacrifices. Each group had its own rites and rituals, as each developed ways of living in the face of the enmity of its environment.

These ways of doing things were largely accidental and unconscious growths. They developed out of the needs of the group. When some hairy primitive set out on a hunting trip he took with him the codes, the teachings, and the emotional connotations his group had imparted to his harrowing life. The primitive man learned to do things by doing them. He had no text-books. He learned things by imitating his elders and by doing the things throughout his life that he had done since childhood.

Primitive education was largely imitation and practice. As the modern child plays that he is a grocer, a policeman, or soldier, so the primitive child imagined that he was a mighty hunter and a great warrior. Before he was very old, his father would take him on a hunting expedition, and the child learned by watching other hunters how he could hunt. Soon he was old enough to go with other warriors in their periodic raids upon enemy tribes. At the proper age he was indoctrinated into the rites and ceremonies of the group.

These ways of doing things began to become moral, inviolable; and the medicine men of the primitive groups wisely imagined supernatural sanctions for many of the beliefs and customs. When folkways had reached this stage, they became patterned, unchangeable, undisturbed. Decade after decade the primitive man would inculcate into the life-consciousness of his son or daughter the tribal customs and folkways. Often initiation into the secrets and customs of the tribe was a painful, torturing experience. The nascent warrior had to prove his hardihood, before the older warriors would accept him as one of their number.

But as soon as primitive morality became a patterned, inviolable thing, it closed its doors to progress. Any thinker who deigned to question the moral patterns of the group would unceremoniously be quoited out of general presence. This hung as a fearful threat over the heads of the ambitious ones. To be thrown out of the tribe, to lose contact with one's friends, one's family, and the protection and sustenance that the tribe provided was a terrifying experience.

The horror of being ostracized from the primitive community can well be imagined. Denizens of the jungle stalked their prey like angry cats after a mouse. Members of enemy groups would kill and mutilate the unfortunate one on sight. Night and its terrors closed down upon the lone individual, like the thud of a heavily-bound volume closing down upon the crisp whiteness of its printed pages. The angry gods—and the gods were always with the community—would vent their indiscriminate fury on the lowly one. Life would be a succession of shocking experiences, of brutality and horror, until the sleepy oblivion of death closed down upon the poor creature, cast out from his tribe, his home, and his family.

So customs and ways of doing things took on the form of inviolable patterns; and slight deviation from the pattern of conduct imposed by the community meant death. Morality was conformity; religion was convention. Indoctrination was the natural pedagogical concomitant to such a way of life. Morality was conformity; religion was convention; but it was certain, safe, and sure—and it relieved the primitive man from the necessity of thinking.

Compared with the certainty of primitive morality, that of our own time must look like a confused mosaic. This is an evolving world; a world of change. We are rapidly approaching a complete transformation from an agricultural economy to a machine economy. We are substituting machines for men. We are developing new methods and new techniques of handling things. Transformations in thinking and living are disturbing our old moral moorings. Religion is feeling the weight of scepticism; science is smothered under the burden of irreconcilable hostilities. Theories glare at one another. On all sides men are armed to the teeth, waiting to march to death and destruction. The world is confused; its educators and statesmen are confused; its scientists and philosophers are confused. Flux and change, the ebb and flow of events, the ceaseless hammering of progress is cracking our old morality wide open. In the modern world nothing seems quite solid or stable.

Even primitive morality was not stable forever. As the primitive man came out from his caves and small villages to build civilization, he found himself no longer primitive and his morality disconcertingly outmoded. To meet the new conditions of life imposed upon him by the moving finger of progress he had to change some of his ways of doing things. Primitive morality broke down under the weight of an evolving universe; a new morality had to develop.

The Greeks built Athens and a new morality. Aristophanes lamented the fact that in the day of Socrates Athens no longer had the stolid morality that had made her victorious on every field. Confusion had set in, and Aristophanes longed to return to the days of a patterned morality. The Sophists roamed the streets searching for unwary citizens upon whom they could practice their obnoxious rhetoric. They taught the people of Athens that nothing mattered except the individual. This flamboyant pedagogy encouraged a reckless individualism, and the race was always to the swift, the battle to the strong.

As the greatest of the Sophists, Socrates carried the doctrine of individualism one step further. He suggested that the individual should base his moral judgments upon reflective thinking. Virtue, he said, is knowledge; morality is intelligence. When men err, it is not because they are bad, but only because they are ignorant. Teach men to be gentle and wise, and all confusion comes to an end.

Plato, a pupil of Socrates, disagreed. Socrates was

correct, he argued, in saying that the individual should judge for himself what course he was to follow; but this world is only a world of appearance, and therefore men err even though they are possessed of great knowledge. Objects and things of our experience, said Plato, are merely external representations of the ideas of things which lie behind all appearance. To be virtuous, then, one has merely to find out the true idea behind an object or course of action. But only philosophers, Plato maintained, can find such essences behind appearance, and therefore the state should be ruled by philosophers.

Then Aristotle, a pupil of Plato, jumped down into the arena of epistemological argument and suggested slightly different doctrines. Any activity, he said, in which man engages has two extremes. A man may eat too much food or too little; or he may exercise too much or too little. Between these two extremes lies a golden mean which everyone should follow. One has merely to be temperate in one's eating and drinking. One has merely to take the middle course between two extremes. We can apply this rule to every phase of life.

The answers of Socrates, of Plato, and of Aristotle to the problems that beset their age—an age strikingly like ours in its moral confusion—represent the opinions of the greatest Greek thinkers on the confusion of a changing, evolving pattern of living. What is the common element in them? Each of these three doctrines stresses the individual nature of moral judgments. Each of these doctrines implies that man must rely on his inner spiritual knowledge. Each implies that the spiritual and intellectual elements of morality are the only stability. Socrates would have complete knowledge about two courses of action, and would choose the wiser. Plato would define the essence or idea behind any moral decision he had to make. Aristotle would merely be temperate; he would invoke the magic formula: the golden mean. The three wise Greeks easily saw the spiritual element in all morality.

So the Greek answer to the moral confusion was individualism and intelligence. A man must, first of all, make his own moral decisions. And he must, secondly, employ his intelligence in solving the moral problems that deploy before him. Can we take the Greek answer to the problem of changing and evolving morality and use it in our own confused moral morass?

Perhaps we can employ parts of the Greek answer. But today we are faced by a vast technology, a machine industry, which uncoils like some slimy monster from its primitive chaos. This is the age of power, or noise, of machines. Prodigious robots do our work, and great machines regiment our lives. This technological element was not to be found in the Greek civilization. Its simple agricultural and mechanical processes were carried on, usually, by very simple contrivances, and often by hand.

But machines have brought coöperation; and technology means collectivity of enterprise. Man, whether he likes it or not, is forced to coöperate with his fellows. One man drives Smith to work each morning. Another entertains him over the radio; and while he is separating one account from another in his office, the car that he is going to buy is being built by other men, hundreds of miles from his home and office. The postman brings his mail; the milkman, the milk; the grocer, the food for himself and his family. He, in his turn, separates interlocking directorates, teaches someone else's children, drives a bus, mends broken bones, or repairs old shoes.

The Greeks gave us individualism and intelligence; and progress has given us coöperation. The primitive fellowship that characterized the primitive group is with us again. But we also have individualism, the doctrine that man has a right to think things out for himself, to make his own moral decisions. To be a living, coöperating, thinking, and evolving individual in the modern world is the natural corollary of the democratic way of life.

Underneath the bubbling surface of modern life man is evolving a new morality fitted to the needs of modern life—a morality for moderns! In the midst of a confusing welter of noise and machines, man is learning to think and coöperate with his fellows. He is learning to combat the real enemies of man: war, disease, and death. As a primitive man clings to the pattern morality of his group so that he may survive, so, too, the modern man clings to his greatest weapons—intelligence and coöperation—in order that he may survive in the face of the evolving realities of contemporary life. For the morality imposed by our machines is that of coöperation and intelligence. It is a morality of turning wheels, smoking furnaces, racing trucks and trains; but it is also a morality of intelligence and coöperation, of comfort and civilization.

AID TO GREAT BRITAIN

The following is a brief statement of some of the steps that I believe should be taken in order to make certain the defense of America and to keep the way open for the development of liberty in the world:

(1) The speedy passage of Bill 1776 with only minor amendments and after the briefest possible adequate discussion, to the end that Great Britain shall receive before it is too late such materiel and other physical supplies as may be needed in terms of sales, loans, or gifts.

(2) The convoying of supplies with such a force and for such a distance as shall insure their delivery with the maximum of safety to the convoys.

(3) The opening of American ports and shipyards for the entry of British ships for re-fueling and repairs.

(4) The commandeering for our own purposes or for loan to Great Britain of all belligerent ships now harbored in American ports, with suitable compensation or settlement left for later determination.

(5) The seizure of such islands in American waters as are now under the control of countries dominated by Germany, and of others as events may reveal them to be in imminent danger of coming under German dominance.

In my judgment, American public opinion will support vigorous action in these matters.

CURTIS W. REESE.

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention.—*Editor.*]

XXXI

The New York *Times* publishes the following item:

The Institute for Propaganda Analysis made public recently results of a study showing that organized pacifism in the church is "much stronger today" than it was in 1917. Virtually every church body in the country, the study found, is on record as favoring non-combatant duty for the conscientious objector.

"Up to the present time," the statement said, "the Protestant churches have registered 6,000 conscientious objectors." The three faiths—Protestant, Catholic and Jewish—have organized peace movements among their congregations, it was reported.

"Churches in America which stress pacifism as a central part of their faith have a membership of about 365,000," according to the report, "divided as follows: The Friends, about 125,000; the Mennonites, about 100,000, and the Church of the Brethren, about 140,000. Allowing for members of some pacifist churches who are not pacifists and for members of non-pacifist churches who are pacifists, the total number of Christian pacifists in the country may be about 450,000, less than 1 per cent of this country's total church membership but a dynamic minority moved to high zeal by a faith which flourishes under adversity."

The report commented that the anti-war position of religious pacifists "tends to be constant, no matter what happens in the present conflict," and should be distinguished from the position of church groups opposing the war for political reasons or because of the racial background of their members.

On January 10th last, the Reverend Arle Brooks, a worker with the American Friends Service Committee, was sentenced in a federal court in Philadelphia to a year and a day in prison, for refusing to register for the draft. In pronouncing sentence, Judge George A. Welsh said:

I would obey the law if it meant my life. I must sentence you as a judge, but as a man with sons I admire your strength of character, although I don't share your views. Countless millions feel as you feel and are in accord with the ideals you have expressed. You must have wrestled with the problem in solitude, but America is not normal today and you must be charitable with us. Consider that I am your father, and I am talking to you as if you were my son. It may seem hard for a boy to feel that the ideals he stands for are stricken down and that he will have to wear stripes in a prison cell, but the law of the land must be obeyed. The sentence I give you is imposed upon me as a judge ordered to uphold the law. What I am about to do makes me feel like Pontius Pilate.

Harry Emerson Fosdick writes in the *Christian Century:*

In replying to the question proposed by the *Christian Century*, "If America is drawn into war, can you, as a Christian, participate in it or support it?" my answer must be, No! * * * if the issue is drawn, some of us will have to abide by the consequences. We will not use our Christian ministry to support war. As for myself, I am essentially a Quaker, and my convictions belong in what seems to me the great tradition of the Society of Friends.

The New York *Herald-Tribune* publishes the following report:

Clergymen who condone modern warfare lack the spiritual vision which is one of the principal causes of "the mad stampede of our nation to war," the Reverend Leon Merle Flanders said at Tremont Presbyterian Church, Grand Concourse at 178th Street, the Bronx.

"There was a time, soon after the last war, when it looked as if the Christian Church would stand united in its refusal to bless another such conflict," he said. "That time has been forgotten. The excuse is given that the issues for which we fight today are moral issues. If we trust the teachings of Jesus a moral issue is no longer moral when it requires physical force instead of spiritual power to uphold it."

The Reverend Mr. Flanders said that a government that failed to exhaust every means to peace before turning to war did not deserve the confidence and support of the people.

"National policies are being forged in the furnace of the emotions instead of being the ripe fruit of an enlightened and understanding reason," he continued. "All the foolishness of human wisdom has been brought to the surface by the crisis into which we have been projected by world events. No attempt is being made to view the difficult problems of the hour in the heaven-sent light which is a recognized part of our Christian heritage. The frantic question is—what to do? The only answer so far has been—resist. Fight! Kill! Destroy! It is an answer as old as the cave man. Its origin is in the jungle."

A subscriber in Santa Clara, California, sends us the following:

Overheard during a parade was the following conversation between two ten-year-old girls.

First Girl: "Oh! don't you love the music! Doesn't it make you just want to march away to the wars!"

Second Girl: "That's why they play it!" Then after a short pause she added, sudden indignation in her voice, "That's why they *ought not* to play it!"

The *Christian Century* reports the following:

The Youth Anti-War Congress, in concluding its fourth annual meeting, in Madison, Wisconsin, pledged to support the repeal of the conscription act, declaring that "the maintenance and expansion of American democracy requires the repeal of conscription, and to that end we dedicate our efforts." The congress also voted to advocate democracy in training camps by stressing the right of conscripts to criticize, no racial discrimination, and better housing and health facilities. It will support religious conscientious objectors. It also condemned projects which, it said, have been approved by President Roosevelt to assemble young people in compulsory work camps. The congress urged no further aid or diplomatic action leading to American involvement in war; no change in the cash and carry act; no loans or credits to underwrite Britain's war plans; no repeal of the Johnson anti-loan act. Sponsors of the convention included nearly a score of unofficial representatives of religious or church-related organizations.

A foretaste of what is coming in this country is given in the experience of a pacifist clergyman as reported in the *Christian Century:*

Religious liberty in the United States is "being threatened by persons who are attempting to thwart United States peace efforts," W. Marion Jeschke, pastor of St. Luke's Evangelical and Reformed Church, charged in Buffalo, New York. He disclosed that he had been requested by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to list his affiliations with peace organizations. "If we are not careful," he said, "the time will not be far off when the members of both the pew and the pulpit will find themselves in prison cells simply because they speak the words of the Prince of Peace. This is a time when the Christian church must speak the truth."

Arrested and indicted for refusing to register under the Draft Act, the Reverend Winslow Wilson, a youthful clergyman, married and father of two children, offered the following plea in the United District Court of Minnesota:

I plead guilty to the charge of failing and refusing to present myself for and submit myself to registration under the Selective Service Act of 1940—having chosen instead to ap-

pear before the Registration Board at Brownsdale, Minnesota, and to file my "Statement of Christian Conviction in Protest against Registration for Conscription." I did this to exalt not my own individual will but the will of God as I see it. I have violated a man-made law and am ready to receive whatever penalty is imposed upon me. But I am confident that I have violated no law of God.

As a Christian I can take no part in war or preparation for war, because war and the Christian Gospel are antithetical:

Christ commands love; war commands hate.
Christ commands truth; war commands lies.
Christ commands service; war commands murder.
Christ commands coöperation; war commands division.
Christ commands creativity; war commands destruction.
Christ commands suffering accepted; war commands suffering inflicted.

Between these two sets of values, there can be no compromise. War and dictatorship abroad cannot be overcome by more war and more dictatorship at home (toward which conscription is a step). Evil cannot be overcome by evil—but only by good.

My objection to war is not merely to taking part in the actual killing—to firing a gun or loading it for someone else to fire. My objection is more fundamental than that—it is against an institution, the war system, and its whole way of life. Wherever I can possibly do so, I must refuse to coöperate with that system and throw the whole weight of my being against it. The logical place to make that refusal is where the war-machine first calls upon me for an act of coöperation, which under the present conscription law is at the point of registration. Registration cannot realistically be viewed, as many claim, as a mere census—this "census" is an integral part of war-preparation; and as such I can take no part in it.

I fully realize that such a stand as I am taking seems to place me in a position of defiance of and disloyalty to my government; this I have no desire to do. I desire to be a law-abiding citizen and intend to continue to obey all the laws of my government—except one which would compel me to do what my conscience forbids. I firmly believe that all that we as Americans hold dear in democracy and freedom depends finally not on military strength but on such a conscientious citizenship, recognizing, in the words of Chief Justice Hughes, that "in the forum of conscience, duty to a moral power higher than the State has always been maintained. . . . The essence of religion is belief in a relation to God involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation."

As a Christian, my final loyalty must be to God, and under Him I will give myself as a free man in service to my country. But when, as under military conscription, the commands of the State and the commands of the Christain conscience conflict, I must choose to follow my Christian conscience. "We ought to obey God rather than men." (*Acts* 5:29.)

Let me say in closing that I fully respect those who conscientiously follow a course different from mine. I do not harbor any ill will against those who have been or will be called upon to carry on a prosecution against me; I could not expect them to act differently under the law. But I am confident that before the bar of history, as before the judgment throne of God, this law will stand condemned—and those who have suffered under it for conscience sake will be exonerated.

Following this plea, Mr. Wilson was sentenced to serve a year and a day in prison.

Trumpets on New Horizons

Song for Dreamers

A dream may weave a secret cord
That holds two hearts within its scope,
Until against the mother heart
Lies the fulfillment of their hope.

A dream may be the stepping-stone
That leads a nation to its goal;
A dream may shape new thoughts that bind
A severed race into a whole.

Discard the dreams of yesterday—
Today is cowled in graying dusk;
Suppress the dreamers now, and find
Tomorrow is an empty husk!

BLANCHE STEWART.

Red Stain

Who are these multitudes, unarmed, forgotten,
German, and British, and "Hemisphere"?
These are the innocents, lately begotten;
We are the mothers who brought them here.

We are the women in soldiers' embraces;
We, giving birth for the loot or the doles.
Can we look, then, on the Little Ones' faces,
When we loose war on their bodies and souls?

Pour in the bread, and the song, and the shelter;
Children are cheap. But Oh, deafen with bands,
And blind us with flags that will cover the welter,
Lest we remember—and look *on our hands!*

LUCY REYNOLDS.

Spears to Ploughshares

The spears of our wrath are blunted
On the stolid breast of time.
The rhythm of life is desperate,
We look in vain for the rhyme.

But some day our spears will be ploughshares,
We'll let the heart be our drum.
That day we'll strike the portal
That swings to millennium!

LUCIA TRENT.

Reverberations

The rude reverberations from torn homelands,
Across the water, would annul the glow
Of ecstasy that spring is on our willows.
Reverberations whisper warnings low,
"Rejoice, you knowing life and living's pleasure. . .
Able to claim their possibility.
Our spring re-heralds torn and bleeding matter
Once human, shrieks of war's adversity.
You, favored one, hold fast in fear and trembling
To prayer that gods of war may still their guns
Before their bloated lips of false dissembling
Entice your land, your freedom and your sons."

GRACE STILLMAN MINCK.

Conscription

Take the young men, but leave the old to mourn
And put on black and sympathize at home.
Take all the strong, and leave the weak alone
To perish in the suburbs, and the intelligent
That imbeciles may procreate and people
The world with simpletons.
Make it imperative
By propagandic phrase that all the men
Of courage and of right go forth to die,
And leave degeneracy to rot in cells
Or, free, to work its will.
So may you rear
A splendid, simple, childish world
That will go speeding down the scale of man
To darkness and oblivion.

HELEN WADE SIEBENTHAL.

The Study Table

The Gospel of a World Community

THE WORLD COMMUNITY. *By Robert Whitaker. Published by the author, Los Gatos, California. 60 cents postpaid.*

Here is a book important beyond all measure of its size, or the length of this review. The American public is little inclined to pamphlet literature but here is a pamphlet, 76 pages long, which bulks larger than many an impressive book in cloth covers.

Dr. Whitaker, well known as an heroic pacifist in the last war, and as the author of the famous hymn, "My Country Is the World," here presents his interpretation of the real message and mission of Judaism and Christianity, and indeed of all true religion. Written in a simple, clear, and occasionally eloquent literary style, the book tells in outline the story of the Jews, Jesus, the early church, and shows how each was in turn betrayed, very largely by forces generated from within, and the work of the spirit thus left undone. The Jews had a world conception, the idea of "the kingdom" as the community of the common folk who are all the children of the one God; and they were misled, even by the prophets, in "their conceit of Yahweh's favor." Jesus inherited from Israel this dream of a world community, founded on freedom, justice and dignity for all human beings, and glorified it by the supreme genius of his mind and the overwhelming power of his person. "* * * The overflow of all special privilege, the exaltation of the whole body of human need, the devotion unto death in lowly everyday service toward those who most need to be recognized as having equal human value with the foremost among us, this * * * was the essence of what Jesus did, of what Jesus had to say, of his desire beyond any recognition of himself." But it was just this "recognition" and deification of his Person that ruined his work, and sanctified those "divisions among men, the world-destroying gulfs between the recognized and the unrecognized, the privileged and the unprivileged" which constitutes "the supreme atheism of humanity, * * * the atheism which Jesus denied." As for the early church, Dr. Whitaker recites effectively an oft-told tale of the greatest religious movement of history changed to the tragedy of a dogmatic supernaturalism, a gospel corrupted into an ecclesiastical hierarchy, and the Jesus of history supplanted by the Christ of the creeds. The part Paul played in this tragedy is admirably depicted. But the ideal of brotherhood, of "the kingdom," of the world community, of heaven here and not merely in the life to come, never perished. Like the grain of wheat in the hand of the mummy, it lived on. Still sounds the challenge which must be answered if religion is not to fail, and civilization disappear. Says Dr. Whitaker:

> Unless organized religion in all its manifestations, Jew and Gentile, Catholic and Protestant, orthodox and liberal, Christian or pagan, aye, even atheistic, can rise to this primary concern for the needy, this recognition that the world community can only come by way of the world myriads who carry the common burden in the fields of labor, this courage unto persecution and death to share with the prophets of the ages their denunciations of privilege in every form, their determination to cast down the mighty from their seats, for the exaltation of them of low degree, . . . organized religion, in every aspect of it, is doomed to an increasing indifference on the part of the vast majority of humankind, or to poverty of survival more to be feared than extinction would be.

What Dr. Whitaker means by the world community is clearly stated. The program is, first, "that human need shall be given first place, as against special advantage for the favored few"; secondly, "that government shall be administered from the ranks of the unprivileged, the common people"; thirdly, "a revision of moral standard * * * a communal ethic, and not a competitive ethic"; and, lastly, the recognition of the fact "that the road to the realization of this program will lead through processes of revolution as long as special privilege is in power."

Dr. Whitaker has stripped religion of all supernaturalism, eliminated dogma, and presented anew the rigor and the promise of the social gospel. His able historical survey leads to irresistible ethical conclusions which involve at once the vindication of true religion in a paganly materialistic age, and the salvation of mankind at an hour of desperate collapse. O, if the world would but heed and follow!

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

BOOK NOTES

CHARLES A. HAWLEY

A New Study in Comparative Religion

THE GLORIOUS KINGDOM OF THE FATHER FORETOLD. *By Virgie V. Vail. New York: Bahai Publishing Committee.*

This book is an addition to the ever-growing library of books on comparative religion. It is unique in that it is a Bahaist commentary on the idea of the Kingdom of God. Bahaism, the outgrowth of the teaching of Baha Ullah (1817-1892), holds to a progressive revelation of God. God reveals himself periodically in history: in Abraham, in Moses, in Jesus, in Muhammed, in Baha. "The religion of God is the One Religion, and all the prophets have taught it, but it is a living and a growing thing, not lifeless and unchanging. In the teaching of Moses we see the Bud; in that of Christ the Flower; in that of Baha -u-llah the Fruit. The flower does not destroy the bud, nor does the fruit destroy the flower." Baha Ullah taught the unity of all religion; he taught pacifism and the urgent necessity for world peace through good will. That many persons in the Middle West believe in these things is demonstrated by the great Bahaist temple near Chicago.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

A Book for Preachers

NOT ALONE. *By Joseph R. Sizoo. New York: The Macmillan Company. 99 pp.* $1.25.

Dr. Sizoo, Pastor of the Collegiate Church of St. Nicholas, is recognized as one of the most eminent preachers in America. This, his latest book, is a brief series of excellently written messages to people worn to impatience and weariness by the wars of this generation. *Not Alone* emphasizes the faith that just beyond the shadow stands God ready and waiting to help. God is patient, believes Dr. Sizoo. Why cannot we be like him in this respect? The beauty of this book lies not only in the thought, but also in the diction. Why do not our theological schools teach their young preachers how to write? This book might well be used as a source book in the art of homiletics.

Toward the Improvement of American Preaching

EXPOSITORY PREACHING. *By R. Ames Montgomery. New York: Fleming H. Revell & Company.* 90 *pp.* $1.00.

PREPARING PREACHERS TO PREACH. *By R. Ames Montgomery. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.* 249 *pp.* $1.75.

Professor Montgomery lately retired as Professor of Homiletics in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Chicago. His theories of preaching and his ideas as a teacher are contained in his last two books. The author believes the preacher of today has an opportunity as never before in the history of civilization. It is his job to incorporate truth in the lives of individuals and of institutions. He pleads for a return to expository preaching in which the Bible provides the content for sermons. Every parish minister will find these books valuable aids in this most difficult task of the present time.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

Where Is God in the Present Conflict?

IS GOD EMERITUS? *By Shailer Mathews. New York: The Macmillan Company.* 93 *pp.* $1.50.

Dean Mathews will long be remembered by his fellow Americans as a most useful man. Long a teacher, advisor, president of various organizations, he has rendered, and is yet rendering, a most valued service to his generation. Now that he is Dean Emeritus he uses his significant title when he comes to tell men, in an age of ever-growing confusion, what God can mean in the present age of chaos. God, says the author, is the "personality-producing activity of the cosmos." We depend on God since we are persons, and our relationship is measured in what we know as personal. Man is, in a measure, helpless, dependent on God. "History is the record of demoniac power too great to be opposed by man and can be overcome only when God chooses to act." But God "chooses to act" differently today from that ancient time when he "not only approved but commanded the wholesale massacre of enemies." After all, what is the delusion known as progress?

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

A Christian Science Life of Jesus

WHO WAS THIS NAZARENE? *By Albert F. Gilmore. New York: Prentice-Hall.* 331 *pp.* $2.75.

Of the writing of lives of Christ there shall be no end. All schools of thought, every ecclesiastical group has its interpretation of the great Master. This is the world's tribute to his diamond-like life; one sees the light by one facet, another by another. Dr. Gilmore's life is well-written, readable, and interesting from the fact that it is the first full-length life to interpret Jesus in the light of the teachings of Christian Science. And this is gently done. Nowhere does the book announce itself as an interpretation; only once is Mary Baker Eddy referred to, yet the idea that Jesus demonstrated the destruction of material law through his divine power shines forth on every page. Any one will be helped and benefitted by reading this excellent book.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 178)

will be supplied by the Japanese. Those whose only consideration is to wonder where their next meal will come from will inevitably be influenced by those who in fact provide their rice.

"For these reasons I regard as some of the real heroes of the war the handful of Chinese Christian clergy and doctors who have stayed on in the occupied areas to stand by the destitute there. It is said rather too easily by Chinese who have moved from the areas that all leaders who stay are puppets and traitors. But there can and should be a motive to stay and work on in occupied areas out of loyalty to the destitute Chinese. It is however rare to get any educated Chinese who will agree with this point. Yenching is a rare exception, disliked in most of the rest of China, when it keeps University work going under Japanese rule.

"In this situation my main impression all through the war is how God redeems and overrules evil, and makes the wrath of man turn to His praise. Suffering, accepted and borne, does redeem. In all sorts of ways the day of intense suffering in China is proving a day of intense opportunity for Christian forward work. In the occupied areas, both missionaries and the Chinese Christian doctors and clergy have done admirable sacrificial service. Their heroism and their witness is having its effect. It is making the hesitant onlooker say that, if in the midst of suffering those who are touched by the spirit of Christ stay to serve when they were free to go, there must be more in this Christian movement than we knew.

"One thing of abiding worth in the whole situation is the new-found coöperation between different Christian groups. In Canton we had a situation, where nothing but faultless coöperation of every available Christian resource could have coped with the need. We had to feed twenty thousand refugees at about a day's notice, with a complete breakdown of every kind of public service. The need drew out the response. We forgot every other difference. We discovered our unity at the place where all our varying faiths became one, the common love of Christ and the common service in His Name toward the destitute. For six months I worked myself as secretary of the international and interdenominational refugee committee; and every Christian group, including all those normally furthest apart, worked as a perfect team. The Roman Catholics were especially good. They worked side by side in one team with the larger Reformed Churches, the Salvation Army and small Adventist sects. We federated all relief work under one central committee. Through this committee we had a common policy for all common concerns, such as the purchase and distribution of food and negotiations with the Japanese. For efficiency we delegated subordinate control wherever we could. As one instance, the Salvation Army had complete control of all the running of one refugee camp; this gave them one camp in which they could run services and evangelism after their own customs.

"It is a day of immense need and immense opportunity for Christian work in China. I long that the older Churches may rise to the opportunity. After five years in China, I feel that many things need reforming in mission education, policy, and strategy. Far too much mission thinking and planning at home is related to the Church overseas as it was fifty years ago, rather than as it is today. In particular, a far more specialist type of missionary is wanted, as the younger churches pass from infancy to adolescence, and therefore need more mature teachers. This in turn means new methods of appointment, by which in the Church overseas, as in the Church at home, picked people are selected and placed in picked specialist posts. Far too often, people are holding posts in Universities in China because the mission has a stake in the college rather than because they were people who would have been given such an appointment in America or England. And the opening in the new Chinese Government Universities is as yet almost entirely neglected.

"When I say things like this to my Chinese friends in educational work, always they warmly agree. When I say it at home, it is too often regarded as a new and unwelcome view. The fact is that in the world Church and its organization, precisely as in the birth of a new international and political order in the West, a new world is coming to birth. In both fields, a few sentences along this kind of line seem to drive a wedge between those who are thinking in terms of ten or fifty years ago, and those who are thinking in terms of the present and of ten years ahead."

—*The Christian News Letter, Oxford, England.*